

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed January 12, 2004, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 11, and 16 through 18 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1 through 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 stand rejected. Claims 4 through 6, and 9 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the arguments set forth hereinbelow.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections

Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 3,484,534 to Kilby et al.

Claims 1 through 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Kilby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,484,534). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claim 1 of the present claimed invention is directed to a method of fabricating an integrated circuit package. The method comprises: providing a semiconductor die having a plurality of conductive pads; forming a leadframe including at least two conductors, each conductor of the at least two conductors having a first end and a second end and a generally arcuate-shaped portion between the first and second ends, at least a portion of each generally arcuate-shaped portion exhibiting a constant radius; configuring and positioning the at least two conductors *such that line spacing between the generally arcuate-shaped portion of each of the at least two conductors is constant*; electrically coupling the first ends of each of the at least two conductors with at least one of the plurality of conductive pads; and encapsulating the

semiconductor die and at least a portion of the at least two conductors with an insulating material.

The Examiner cites Kilby as disclosing a method of fabricating an integrated circuit package, “the method comprising: providing a semiconductor die (24) having a plurality of conductive pads (col. 4, lines 61-67) forming at least two conductors (20), each conductor of the at least two conductors having a first end (20a) and a second end (20b) and a generally arcuate shaped portion between the first and second ends (See Figs. 2 and 6), at least a portion of each generally arcuate-shaped portion exhibiting a constant radius; configuring and positioning the at least two conductors such that line spacing between the generally arcuate-shaped portion of each of the at least two conductors is constant (Figs. 2/6); electrically coupling the first ends of each of the at least two conductors with at least one of the plurality of conductor pads (figs. 4/5); and encapsulating the semiconductor die and at least a portion of the at least tow conductors with and insulating material (Figs. 3-7 Col. 4, line 71-74).” (Final Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Kilby generally discloses the patterning of a thin conductive sheet to form a plurality of lead strips (20) therefrom. Some of the lead strips include a generally arcuate-shaped portion. However, in comparing different lead strips and the respective arcuate-shaped portions thereof, Kilby does not appear to be teach that the line spacing between such respective arcuate-shaped portions be constant. Rather, considering, for example, the two lead strips positioned on the left hand side of the FIG. 2, each lead contains an arcuate-shaped portion which forms a 90° bend. Each of these two arcuate-shaped portions appear to have substantially the same radii (including the same respective inner radii, outer radii and nominal radii) and substantially the same arc length as each other. As a matter of geometry, two identical arcuate segments (e.g., having the same radii and arc lengths) can not be positioned adjacent one another and be physically able to maintain constant line spacing therebetween. Additionally, Kilby fails to expressly disclose that it is desirable to configure and position at least two conductors *such that line spacing between the generally arcuate-shaped portion of each of the at least two conductors is constant.*

It is noted that each of the two left-most leads discussed above include additional arcuate-shaped segments (i.e. to the right of the 90° bends and close to their respective “first ends” (20a)). However, it is apparent from viewing FIG. 2, that line spacing varies considerably between such arcuate-shaped segments. Applicants further submit that the other leads shown in FIG. 2 likewise fail to be configured and positioned such that their respective arcuate-shape portions or segments define constant line spacing between themselves and an arcuate-shaped portion of another lead.

Applicants, therefore, submit that claim 1 is clearly allowable over Kilby. Applicants further submit that claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11 are also allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim as well as for the additional patentable subject matter introduced thereby.

With respect to claim 3, Kilby fails to teach that forming the at least two conductors further comprises forming each generally arcuate-shaped portion of each of the at least two conductors to *exhibit a different arc length than any other generally arcuate-shaped portion of any other conductor of the at least two conductors*.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 through 3, 7, 8, 10 and 11.

Claims 9 and 16

Applicants note that, in the body of Final Action, claims 1-3, 7-11, and 16 are stated as being anticipated by Kilby. However, the Examiner does not specifically apply the teachings of Kilby to claims 9 or 16. Additionally, in the Summary of the Final Action, and on page 3 of the Final Action, the Examiner indicates claim 9 as being objected to as depending from a rejected base claim but containing allowable subject matter. Similarly, the Examiner indicates claim 16 as being allowable in the Summary of the Final Action and on page 3 thereof.

It appears to Applicants that claims 9 and 16 were not intended to be rejected by the Examiner based on the Kilby reference and, therefore, Applicants do not discuss either claim 9 and 16 as compared to the device disclosed by Kilby.

Objections to Claims 4 through 6, and 9/Allowable Subject Matter


Claims 4 through 6, and 9 stand objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but are indicated to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if placed in appropriate independent form.

Applicants submit that claim 1, from which claims 4 through 6 and 9 depend, is in condition for allowance and, therefore, so are claims 4 through 6 and 9. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 4 through 6 and 9.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1 through 11, and 16 through 18 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Bradley B. Jensen
Registration No. 46,801
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: March 11, 2004
BBJ/nj:dp

Document in ProLaw